1	PAUL J. RIEHLE (SBN 115199) paul.riehle@faegredrinker.com FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH L	RICHARD J. DOREN, SBN 124666 rdoren@gibsondunn.com JLP DANIEL G. SWANSON, SBN 116556
2	Four Embarcadero Center	dswanson@gibsondunn.com
3	San Francisco, California 94111 Telephone: (415) 591-7500	JASON C. LO, SBN 219030 jlo@gibsondunn.com
4	Facsimile: (415) 591-7510	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
4	GARY A. BORNSTEIN (pro hac vice)	333 South Grand Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197
5	gbornstein@cravath.com	Telephone: 213.229.7000
6	YONATAN EVEN (pro hac vice) yeven@cravath.com	Facsimile: 213.229.7520
	LAUREN A. MOSKOWITZ (pro hac vice)	CYNTHIA E. RICHMAN (D.C. Bar No. 492089; <i>pro hac vice</i>)
7	lmoskowitz@cravath.com	crichman@gibsondunn.com
8	JUSTIN C. CLARKE (pro hac vice) jcclarke@cravath.com	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP 1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
9	MICHAEL J. ZAKEN (pro hac vice)	Washington, DC 20036-5306
	mzaken@cravath.com M. BRENT BYARS (pro hac vice)	Telephone: 202.955.8500
10	mbyars@cravath.com	Facsimile: 202.467.0539
11	CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP 375 Ninth Avenue	JULIAN W. KLEINBRODT, SBN 302085 jkleinbrodt@gibsondunn.com
12	New York, New York 10001	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
	Telephone: (212) 474-1000 Facsimile: (212) 474-3700	One Embarcadero Center, Suite 2600 San Francisco, CA 94111
13	` ,	Telephone: 415.393.8200
14	Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter-defendant Epic Games, Inc.	Facsimile: 415.393.8306
15		MARK A. PERRY, SBN 212532 mark.perry@weil.com
		JOSHUA M. WESNESKI (D.C. Bar No.
16		1500231; <i>pro hac vice</i> pending) joshua.wesneski@weil.com
17		WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
18		2001 M Street NW, Suite 600 Washington, DC 20036
		Telephone: 202.682.7000
19		Facsimile: 202.857.0940
20		Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant Apple Inc.
21	UNITED STATE	S DISTRICT COURT
		RICT OF CALIFORNIA
22	OAKLAN	ND DIVISION
23]
24	EPIC GAMES, INC.,	Case No. 4:20-CV-05640-YGR-TSH
25	Plaintiff, Counter-defendant,	JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
دے	v.	ORDER APPROVING PRIVILEGE RE-
26	APPLE INC.,	REVIEW PROTOCOL
27	Defendant, Counterclaimant.	Courtroom: 1, 4th Floor
28		Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers
	JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]	

ORDER APPROVING PRIVILEGE
RE-REVIEW PROTOCOL

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Court's Orders Appointing Special Masters (ECF No. 1070; ECF No. 1074 (Judges Brazil and Gutierrez); ECF No. 1081 (Judge Segal)), the Plaintiff and Counter-defendant Epic Games, Inc. ("Epic"), and Defendant and Counterclaimant Apple Inc. ("Apple"; Apple and Epic together, the "Parties," and each individually, a "Party") have met and conferred and have agreed, in consultation with the Special Masters, that the following protocol will govern the re-review process directed by Judge Hixson (Dec. 5, 2024 Hr'g Tr. 12:18-23);

THEREFORE, IT IS STIPULATED AND AGREED THAT:

- 1. <u>Re-Review Plan</u>: Apple will re-review all documents identified as responsive to the Court's Order of May 31, 2024 (Dkt. 974) but withheld or redacted as privileged or otherwise protected as identified on Apple's previous privilege logs. Specifically:
 - a. Apple has committed to re-reviewing these documents at a reasonable pace of approximately 15,000 per week.
 - b. Apple will categorize the documents it re-reviews into one of the following three categories:
 - i. Category One: Documents that Apple continues to maintain are privileged or otherwise protected in whole or in part (including for the avoidance of doubt any documents downgraded from withheld to redacted and/or as to which the redactions have changed), including under the December 2 Order.
 - ii. Category Two: Documents that Apple maintains are privileged or otherwise protected in whole or in part, but that Apple acknowledges are not privileged or otherwise protected under Judge Hixson's order of December 2, 2024 (Dkt. 1056).
 - iii. **Category Three**: Documents that Apple no longer maintains are privileged or otherwise protected.

- c. Every Monday beginning the first Monday after the finalization of this re-review protocol, by 5 p.m. Pacific Time, Apple will:
 - Produce to Epic all Category Three documents Apple has identified through 2 p.m. Pacific Time on the preceding Thursday.
 - ii. Produce to the Special Masters all Category One documents

 Apple has identified during the preceding week, clearly
 identifying whether Apple asserts privilege over the document in
 whole or as to specific parts.
 - iii. Produce to Epic and to the Special Masters a privilege log for all Category One documents produced to the Special Masters pursuant to paragraph 1.c.ii above.
- d. The Special Masters will divide among themselves the documents produced to them and determine whether to overrule or sustain each of Apple's privilege assertions, applying general principles governing privilege and protections in the Ninth Circuit as well as the December 2 Order. The Special Masters may confer with each other as to the appropriate treatment of any document or category of documents. Any Special Master may also convene a hearing with the Parties to address documents.
- e. Apple may provide to the Special Masters (and Epic) additional information necessary to support Apple's claim of privilege, including but not limited to declarations. The Special Masters may also request additional information from Apple; if Apple believes such information is itself privileged, Apple may seek permission of the Special Master(s) asking for such information to provide such information *in camera*.

- f. The Special Masters will provide the Parties with weekly reports indicating which documents were reviewed, their ruling as to each of these documents, and any additional information they wish to convey to the Parties.
- Masters not to be privileged within seven (7) calendar days after a report setting forth such a determination, except for documents as to which Apple objects pursuant to Section 4 below.
- h. Apple will produce all Category Two documents to the Special Masters and/or Epic (as appropriate) within five (5) court days after Judge Gonzalez Rogers rules on the pending challenge to the December 2 Order.
- Should any of the Special Masters identify concerns with either party's approach to the re-review process, that Special Master will promptly notify the Parties and the Court of such concerns.
- j. If the Special Masters are unable to conduct the review within a reasonable time, they will promptly notify the Parties. Regardless of such notice, each Party may request to meet and confer on the possibility of expanding the Special Masters panel if the Party believes the review will not be completed within a reasonable time.
- 2. <u>Communication and Preservation</u>: The periodic reports issued by the Special Masters shall be emailed to the Parties (epic-mobileapps@cravath.com; WeilAppleEpic@weil.com; epicapplecompliance@gibsondunn.com). Such email transmittal shall fulfill the Special Master's duty under paragraph 1.f to provide weekly reports to the Parties. The Special Masters shall each preserve the reports in their successive iterations, as well as any working papers they use in the course of their review, for a period of six weeks following the completion of the review process.

27

- 3. <u>Ex Parte Communications</u>: The Special Masters may communicate among themselves in accordance with paragraph 1.d, as well as for administrative purposes. The Special Masters may not engage in *ex parte* communications with any Party or the Court.
- 4. <u>Action On A Special Master's Privilege Rulings</u>: The Special Masters' determinations, as set forth in the periodic reports, shall be subject to ECF No. 985 and Rule 53(f) except as set forth in this paragraph. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 53(b)(2)(D), the procedures shall be modified as follows:
 - a. <u>Time Limits</u>: Any Party wishing to object to a privilege ruling of the Special Master must file such objection with Magistrate Judge Hixson no later than four (4) court days from the issuance of the Special Master's privilege ruling, and the other Party may file a response within two (2) court days of the objection.
 - <u>Briefing and Filing the Record for Review</u>: Objections shall be filed on a document-by-document basis:
 - The objection shall not exceed one page per document, not including the cover sheet.
 - ii. The objecting Party will file with the objection the relevant privilege log entry or entries pertaining to the privilege assertions at issue.
 - iii. Any response also will not exceed one page per document.
 - iv. The Parties may include declarations regarding their respective position.
 - v. Unredacted versions of the document(s) at issue will be provided to the Court for review.
 - c. <u>Production Following Objection</u>: Apple will produce all documents deemed not privileged in a ruling by Judge Hixson within three (3) court days of such ruling unless otherwise directed by the Court.

1	5. <u>Disclosure</u> : Di	sclosure of privileged or protected information to
2	the Special Masters or the Court shall no	ot be a waiver of privilege or a right of protection in this or
3	any other proceeding. Accordingly, a cl	aim of privilege or protection may not be raised as a basis
4	to resist such disclosure.	
5	6. <u>Compensation</u> : Re	esponsibility for payment of the Special Masters' fees shal
6	be divided equally between the Parties	. Each Special Master's fees shall be invoiced and paid
7	pursuant to a separate agreement between the Parties and that Special Master.	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12	Dated: December 20, 2024	Respectfully submitted,
13		By: /s/ Yonatan Even
14		FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH
15		LLP
16		Paul J. Riehle (SBN 115199) paul.riehle@faegredrinker.com
17		-
18		Four Embarcadero Center San Francisco, California 94111
19		Telephone: (415) 591-7500 Facsimile: (415) 591-7510
20		CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP
21		,
22		Gary A. Bornstein (<i>pro hac vice</i>) gbornstein@cravath.com
23		Yonatan Even (<i>pro hac vice</i>) yeven@cravath.com
24		Lauren A. Moskowitz (<i>pro hac vice</i>) lmoskowitz@cravath.com
25		Justin C. Clarke (<i>pro hac vice</i>) jcclarke@cravath.com
26		Michael J. Zaken (pro hac vice) mzaken@cravath.com
27		M. Brent Byars (<i>pro hac vice</i>) mbyars@cravath.com
28	JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER APPROVING PRIVILEGE	

CASE No. 4:20-CV-05640-YGR-TSH

RE-REVIEW PROTOCOL

ORDER APPROVING PRIVILEGE RE-REVIEW PROTOCOL

RE-REVIEW PROTOCOL

Dated:	HON. THOMAS S. HIXSON
	HOW HOWAS S. HASON
JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]	

| JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] | ORDER APPROVING PRIVILEGE | RE-REVIEW PROTOCOL

JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER APPROVING PRIVILEGE RE-REVIEW PROTOCOL